



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. Box 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Paper No. 19

Application Number: 09/162,685
Filing Date: September 29, 1998
Appellant(s): GLASER ET AL.

George H. Gates
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed November 8, 2003.

(1) *Real Party in Interest*

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

Art Unit: 2176

(2) *Related Appeals and Interferences*

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief.

(3) *Status of Claims*

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) *Status of Amendments After Final*

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) *Summary of Invention*

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

(6) *Issues*

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct.

(7) *Grouping of Claims*

Appellant's brief includes a statement that claims 1-34 do not stand or fall together and provides reasons as set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) and (c)(8).

(8) *Claims Appealed*

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

Art Unit: 2176

(9) Prior Art of Record

HTMLed, 4/26/1997 by Internet Software Technologies, downloaded on 6/27/2003, from
<<http://www.winsite.com>>, screenshots pages 1-9.

Nano WebEditor, 8/19/1997 by Namo Interactive Inc., downloaded on 6/27/2003 from
<<http://www.winsite.com>>, screenshots pages 1-8.

5,911,145	ARORA ET AL.	6-1999
6,069,630	LISLE ET AL.	5-2000

(10) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness
rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2, 4, 11-13, 15, 22-24, 27, 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being
unpatentable over HTMLed (hereinafter HTMLed), 4/26/1997 by Internet Software Technologies,
downloaded on 6/27/2003, from <<http://www.winsite.com>>, screenshots pages 1-9.

In regard to independent claim 1, HTMLed teaches an HTML editor comprising a Form Designer for creating/editing a form to be integrated within an HTML page (HTMLed page 3). The Form Designer allows a user to initially drag and drop various form elements onto a designer field as shown by the example created form (HTMLed page 5). After pressing "OK", the code responsible for creating the form is transferred (associated) with a newly created HTML file (sample.htm) (HTMLed page 6). When sample.htm is reopened and/or previewed in Netscape via "Test with Netscape" option (HTMLed page 7-8), the form elements described by Form Designer are defined in sample.htm, which in turn are defined in the page produced in Netscape from said file, therefore displaying a relationship by at least viewing the HTML code (compare with claim 1 "*A method of displaying a relationship between an HTML file and an element from a form, wherein the element is in an HTML page, comprising:*").

HTMLed teaches a file (sample.htm) containing form control code, said sample.htm file can be reasonably interpreted by the skilled artisan as a project file, said sample.htm file containing form code information defining an association between the previously transferred form elements and the page rendered from said sample.htm file (HTMLed page 6; compare with claim 1 "*reading information from a project file, the information comprising a relationship between the element that has been transferred from the form to the HTML page and the HTML file associated with the HTML page;*").

HTMLed teaches creation of a customized form using a FORM Designer window, said window showing a spatial mapping of form elements (HTMLed page 5). Subsequent to pressing the "OK" button, the representative form code information is transferred (mapped) to an HTML file (sample.htm, see HTMLed page 6), the code also acting to preserve the spatial mapping of said elements (compare with claim 1 "*processing the information to map the element from the form to the HTML file;*").

HTMLed teaches display of a sample HTML file (sample.htm, see HTMLed page 6) comprising Form code, said form code showing an association between form elements (i.e. "Radio Button" is associated with the form), and said form code showing a relationship to an HTML file (i.e. the form code is enclosed within sample.htm). The limitation of displaying a mapping would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art at the time of the invention, in view of HTMLed, because of HTMLed's disclosure of sample.htm, and of Form Designer. Since the form elements are associated (related) to the displayed form code block, and said form code block is associated (related) to sample.htm, the preservation of spatial mapping of form elements (HTMLed page 5), provides a reasonable suggestion to the skilled artisan to display the above associations, relations, and preserved spatial mappings as a displayed mapping of relationships, providing the benefit of mapping for a user to better visualize form relationships (compare with claim 1 "*displaying the mapping on a graphical user interface that indicates the relationship between the element, the form, and the HTML file.*").

In regard to dependent claim 2, HTMLed teaches creation of a customized form using a FORM Designer window, said window showing a spatial mapping of form elements (HTMLed page 5). Subsequent to pressing the "OK" button, the representative form code information is transferred (mapped) to an HTML file (for rendering as an HTML page), (sample.htm, see HTMLed page 6), the code also acting to preserve the spatial mapping of said elements when displayed in a Web browser.

In regard to dependent claim 4, HTMLed teaches an element name, and an HTML filename (HTMLed page 6 items sample.htm, and "Radio Button").

In regard to dependent claim 11, HTMLed teaches various editing buttons on a tool bar for modifying and saving into sample.htm (a project file).

In regard to independent claim 12, HTMLed teaches an HTML editor comprising a Form Designer for creating/editing a form to be integrated within an HTML page (HTMLed page 3). The Form Designer allows a user to initially drag and drop various form elements onto a designer field as shown by the example created form (HTMLed page 5). After pressing "OK", the code responsible for creating the form is transferred (associated) with a newly created HTML file (sample.htm) (HTMLed page 6). When sample.htm is reopened and/or previewed in Netscape via "Test with Netscape" option (HTMLed page 7-8), the form elements

Art Unit: 2176

described by Form Designer are defined in sample.htm, which in turn are defined in the page produced in Netscape from said file, therefore displaying a relationship by at least viewing the HTML code (compare with claim 12 *“A apparatus for displaying a relationship between an HTML file and an element from a form, wherein the element is in an HTML page, comprising:”*).

HTMLed teaches a file (sample.htm) containing form control code, said sample.htm file can be reasonably interpreted by the skilled artisan as a project file, said sample.htm file containing form code information defining an association between the previously transferred form elements and the page rendered from said sample.htm file (HTMLed page 6; compare with claim 12 *“means for reading information from a project file, the information comprising a relationship between the element that has been transferred from the form to the HTML page and the HTML file associated with the HTML page,”*).

HTMLed teaches creation of a customized form using a FORM Designer window, said window showing a spatial mapping of form elements (HTMLed page 5). Subsequent to pressing the “OK” button, the representative form code information is transferred (mapped) to an HTML file (sample.htm, see HTMLed page 6), the code also acting to preserve the spatial mapping of said elements (compare with claim 12 *“means for processing the information to map the element from the form to the HTML file,”*).

HTMLed teaches display of a sample HTML file (sample.htm, see HTMLed page 6) comprising Form code, said form code showing an association between form elements (i.e. “Radio Button” is associated with the form), and said form code showing a relationship to an HTML file (i.e. the form code is enclosed within sample.htm). The limitation of displaying a mapping would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of HTMLed, because of HTMLed’s disclosure of sample.htm, and of Form Designer. Since the form elements are associated (related) to the displayed form code block, and said form code block is associated (related) to sample.htm, the preservation of spatial mapping of form elements (HTMLed page 5), provides a reasonable suggestion to the skilled artisan to display the above associations, relations, and preserved spatial mappings as a displayed mapping of relationships, providing the benefit of mapping for a user to better visualize form relationships (compare with claim 12 *“a display for presenting the*

Art Unit: 2176

mapping on a graphical user interface that indicates the relationship between the element, the form, and the HTML file.”).

In regard to claims 13, 15, 22, claims 13, 15, 22 reflect the apparatus comprising computer readable instructions used to perform the methods as claimed in claims 2, 4, 11, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to independent claim 23, HTMLed teaches an HTML editor comprising a Form Designer for creating/editing a form to be integrated within an HTML page (HTMLed page 3). The Form Designer allows a user to initially drag and drop various form elements onto a designer field as shown by the example created form (HTMLed page 5). After pressing “OK”, the code responsible for creating the form is transferred (associated) with a newly created HTML file (sample.htm) (HTMLed page 6). When sample.htm is reopened and/or previewed in Netscape via “Test with Netscape” option (HTMLed page 7-8), the form elements described by Form Designer are defined in sample.htm, which in turn are defined in the page produced in Netscape from said file, therefore displaying a relationship by at least viewing the HTML code (compare with claim 23 “*An article of manufacture, embodying logic to perform a method of displaying a relationship between an HTML file and an element that has been transferred from a form to an HTML page, the method comprising:*”).

HTMLed teaches a file (sample.htm) containing form control code, said sample.htm file can be reasonably interpreted by the skilled artisan as a project file, said sample.htm file containing form code information defining an association between the previously transferred form elements and the page rendered from said sample.htm file (HTMLed page 6; compare with claim 23 “*reading information from a project file, the information comprising a relationship between the element that has been transferred from a form to an HTML page and the HTML file associated with the HTML page;*”).

HTMLed teaches creation of a customized form using a FORM Designer window, said window showing a spatial mapping of form elements (HTMLed page 5). Subsequent to pressing the “OK” button, the

Art Unit: 2176

representative form code information is transferred (mapped) to an HTML file (sample.htm, see HTMLed page 6), the code also acting to preserve the spatial mapping of said elements (compare with claim 23 “*processing the information to map the element from the form to the HTML file;*”).

HTMLed teaches display of a sample HTML file (sample.htm, see HTMLed page 6) comprising Form code, said form code showing an association between form elements (i.e. “Radio Button” is associated with the form), and said form code showing a relationship to an HTML file (i.e. the form code is enclosed within sample.htm). The limitation of displaying a mapping would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of HTMLed, because of HTMLed’s disclosure of sample.htm, and of Form Designer. Since the form elements are associated (related) to the displayed form code block, and said form code block is associated (related) to sample.htm, the preservation of spatial mapping of form elements (HTMLed page 5), provides a reasonable suggestion to the skilled artisan to display the above associations, relations, and preserved spatial mappings as a displayed mapping of relationships, providing the benefit of mapping for a user to better visualize form relationships (compare with claim 23 “*displaying the mapping on a graphical user interface that indicates the relationship between the element, the form, and the HTML file.*”).

In regard to claims 24, 26, 33, claims 24, 26, 33 reflect the article of manufacture comprising computer readable instructions used to perform the methods as claimed in claims 2, 4, 11, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Claims 3, 5, 14, 16, 25, 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over HTMLed (hereinafter HTMLed), 4/26/1997 by Internet Software Technologies, downloaded on 6/27/2003 from <<http://www.winsite.com>>, screenshots pages 1-9, in view of Nano WebEditor (hereinafter Namo), 8/19/1997 by Namo Interactive Inc., downloaded on 6/27/2003 from <<http://www.winsite.com>>, screenshots pages 1-8.

Art Unit: 2176

In regard to dependent claim 3, HTMLed does not specifically teach a non-visual control selected from a group comprising a button, etc. However, Namo teaches a form design editor, whereby a hidden field can be selected for inclusion on a form, said hidden field selected via button "Hidden Field" (Namo page 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Namo to HTMLed, providing a user of HTMLed the benefit of hidden fields to provide information (i.e. statistical, etc.) hidden from a future user of said form.

In regard to dependent claim 5, HTMLed does not specifically teach a form name. However, Namo teaches a form design editor, whereby a form can be given a name (Namo page 4 item "Form Name"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Namo to HTMLed, providing a user of HTMLed the benefit of form names to differentiate between multiple forms.

In regard to claims 14, 16, claims 14, 16 reflect the apparatus comprising computer readable instructions used to perform the methods as claimed in claims 3, 5, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to claims 25, 27, claims 25, 27 reflect the article of manufacture comprising computer readable instructions used to perform the methods as claimed in claims 3, 5, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Claims 6-8, 17-19, 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over HTMLed (hereinafter HTMLed), 4/26/1997 by Internet Software Technologies, downloaded on 6/27/2003 from <<http://www.winsite.com>>, screenshots pages 1-9, in view of Arora et al. (hereinafter Arora), U.S. Patent No. 5,911,145 issued June 1999 (cited in a previous action).

In regard to dependent claim 6, HTMLed teaches element names (i.e. names associated with graphical elements and images), and HTML file names. HTMLed does not specifically teach said names presented in a row of a table. However, Arora teaches an HTML editor, whereby a portion of an HTML page is shown, including various graphical buttons (Arora Figure 22 item 2202, also column 10 lines 18-40). Arora Figure 42 depicts the assets of said page depicted in rows and columns of a table regarding the related files, links, and objects for said page, the items in each column related to the HTML filename representing the page in Figure 22 (Arora Figure 42, also column 14 lines 33-36). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Arora to HTMLed, providing HTMLed the benefit of visually itemizing the mapping of files and their locations, to the forms of HTMLed.

In regard to dependent claim 7, claim 7 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 6, and in further view of the following, is rejected along the same rationale.

HTMLed does not specifically teach cells of a table. However, Arora teaches cells for entry of a mapping (Arora Figure 39). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Arora to HTMLed, providing HTMLed the benefit of showing space and relationships in a visually organized fashion.

In regard to dependent claim 8, claim 8 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 6, and is rejected using the Examiner's argument and rationale as set forth in the rejection of dependent claim 6.

In regard to claims 17-19, claims 17-19 reflect the apparatus comprising computer readable instructions used to perform the methods as claimed in claims 6-8, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Art Unit: 2176

In regard to claims 28-30, claims 28-30 reflect the article of manufacture comprising computer readable instructions used to perform the methods as claimed in claims 6-8, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Claims 9-10, 20-21, 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over HTMLed (hereinafter HTMLed), 4/26/1997 by Internet Software Technologies, downloaded on 6/27/2003 from <<http://www.winsite.com>>, screenshots pages 1-9, in view of Lisle et al. (hereinafter Lisle), U.S. Patent No. 6,069,630 issued May 2000 (cited in a previous action).

In regard to dependent claim 9, HTMLed teaches an ACTION attribute, in which a URL is supplied (mapped) in the form code specifying a location to which contents of a form is submitted to elicit a response (HTMLed page 3 – middle of page, also page 5 item “Action”). HTMLed does not specifically teach flagging an invalid mapping. However, Lisle teaches the indication of a link depending upon whether a link (element) is good or bad (Lisle Figure 4 item 410). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Lisle to HTMLed, providing HTMLed the benefit of providing an updated action URL for its form.

In regard to dependent claim 10, claim 10 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claims 1 and 9, and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to claims 20-21, claims 20-21 reflect the apparatus comprising computer readable instructions used to perform the methods as claimed in claims 9-10, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to claims 31-32, claims 31-32 reflect the article of manufacture comprising computer readable instructions used to perform the methods as claimed in claims 9-10, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

(11) Response to Argument

Beginning with page 5 (at bottom) of the Appeal brief (hereinafter the brief), Appellant argues the following issues which are accordingly addressed below.

a. *“None of the cited references teach, disclose, or suggest providing a mapping from an element transferred from a form to an HTML file associated with an HTML page”* (page 5, at bottom, of the brief) and

“None of the cited references teach, disclose, or suggest displaying a mapping from an element to an HTML file in a graphical user interface that indicates the relationship between the elements, the form, and the HTML file.” (page 6, at top, of the brief).

The examiner respectfully disagrees. It is respectfully submitted that Appellant does not specifically define a type of “mapping” within representative claim 1 (other than said mapping is to be displayed, and said mapping indicates the relationship between the element, the form, and the HTML file), and that Appellant is arguing the specifics of the disclosure, not the claims. Although HTMLed does not disclose “mapping” (i.e. HTMLed does not actually disclose the word “mapping”), nevertheless, it is obvious that page 9 of HTMLed displays a form of mapping which shows the relationship between form elements and a form (i.e. elements “Radio Button”, “submit” etc. within the top window are all related to the final displayed form shown on the

bottom half – the position of each element in the source has a direct bearing on the ordering of the displayed final form elements, and since HTMLed is a form editor, new elements can be added, therefore transferring said new elements to an HTML file, accordingly). Since the displayed source code of the form is contained within an HTML file (a project file), said elements are related to said file, therefore it is obvious to the skilled artisan that a mapping is occurring between said elements, said form, and said file.

b. *“The Office Action then continues and states (on page 4)....Appellants submit that such an assertion is completely without merit. In this regard, the HTML Form elements are defined in the HTML file by the HTML Form code blocks. There is no reference, implicit or explicit, of the form that the element was transferred from whatsoever (as claimed)”* (page 8, at bottom, to page 9, at top of the brief).

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Subsequent to pressing the “OK” button, the representative form code information is transferred (mapped) to an HTML file (sample.htm, see HTMLed page 6). Transferring also occurs between the form itself and its related code blocks. In additional support of the instant rejections, page 9 of HTMLed shows a form which can be edited. Buttons on the right hand side can be selected to insert elements (i.e. checkboxes, etc. as well as “Clear All”). When an element is added (and dragged into position accordingly), its representative code for the added element is eventually transferred to the file code.

c. *“Such a mapping is not even remotely suggested or described in HTMLed. Without describing the mapping, HTMLed cannot possibly describe the timing for when the claimed mapping is generated.”* (page 9, near bottom, of the brief).

The examiner respectfully disagrees. HTMLed teaches that subsequent to pressing the “OK” button, the representative form code information is transferred (mapped) to an HTML file (for rendering as an HTML page). By the time the HTML form (with created/transferred elements) is rendered as an HTML page, all the relevant code information is generated and read. It is respectfully submitted that the examiner can find nothing in instant dependent claim 2 which precludes this interpretation.

d. *“In rejecting these claims, the Office Action relies on Namu page 4, item “Form Name”. However, it is Appellant’s understanding of Namu, that the “Form Name” merely identifies the name of the HTML form that the user is creating.”* (page 10, at middle, of the brief).

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Namu is used to teach the naming of a form, said teaching applied to the naming of the file of HTMLed. It is respectfully noted that, since both HTMLed and Nano are form editors, and since a file can encompass a form by itself (as shown on HTMLed page 9), Nano’s form can be named, reopened, copied (using copy/paste) into HTMLed’s form for further re-editing, and renamed to a new name, etc..

e. *“In this regard, the element name and the name of the HTML file name that the element was transferred to is not displayed in a row of a table in Arora’s Figure 42 or elsewhere.”* (page 11, near bottom, of the brief).


The examiner respectfully disagrees. Arora Figure 42 depicts the assets of an HTML page depicted in rows and columns of a table regarding the related files, links, and objects for said page, the items in each column related to the HTML filename representing the page in Figure 22. The teaching of relationships between elements and their file names (displayed as a table) is applied to HTMLed’s mapped form relationships to better organize said relationship mapping. Arora also teaches entry of data into cells.

Art Unit: 2176

Appellant's arguments on page 13 are directed towards an allegation that the cited art does not specifically teach the limitations of claims 10, 21, 32, and 11, 22, 33. It is respectfully noted that the examiner teaches an HTML file as a project file. When said file (or any file) is opened, the filename is extracted, and the file contents are read by at least the HTMLed application. Lisle teaches an indication of a link depending upon whether a link (element) is good or bad (Lisle Figure 4 item 410). It is additionally noted that if an HTML form file cannot be found by the system, it is obvious to the skilled artisan that the form will not run (i.e. the form will be invalid) when said form file is called. Since HTMLed is a form editor, mappings can be modified, accordingly.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,


JOSEPH H. FEILD
PRIMARY EXAMINER

William L. Bashore
January 11, 2004

Conferees:


Joseph Field


Stephen Hong

GATES & COOPER LLP
HOWARD HUGHES CENTER
6701 CENTER DRIVE WEST, SUITE 1050
LOS ANGELES, CA 90045